APPENDIX

Vol. 31, No. 23 June 9, 1972

REPORT ON THE 80TH MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
Atlanta, Georgia, May 12-13, 1972

John P. MacDonald, University of Connecticut, presided at the 80th meeting of the **Association of Research Libraries** (ARL) held in Atlanta, Ga., on May 12-13. Following his introduction of alternates and guests, Mr. MacDonald noted that the theme of the meeting, "New Opportunities for Research Libraries," would be treated in six substantive sessions. A luncheon program and a business meeting were also held.

In the first session, Russell Shank, Smithsonian Institution, and Frank Norwood, Joint Council on Educational Telecommunications, discussed "Telecommunications: Prospects for Research Libraries." Mr. Shank stated that libraries which are considering sharing resources should break with tradition and take advantage of existing telecommunications technology to develop new delivery systems. He noted that many ARL libraries were already involved in new technologies such as facsimile transmission, computer-to-computer operations, and teletype experiments. Turning to CATV and communications satellite opportunities, Mr. Shank described CATV as not only a system that will bring additional popular television shows into American homes, but also one able to accept hardware and software tailored to user needs and available on demand.

Mr. Norwood commented on satellites, special purpose common carriers, and the recording of information on tape. He mentioned two important Federal Communications Commission decisions—to grant permission to attach "foreign" devices to telephone lines and to build a microwave network from Chicago to St. Louis, thus opening the entire field of networking. The implications of the decisions are that, in the first instance, competition with the telephone company is permissible, and, in the second, changes in rates and regulations may be effected. In discussing special service common carriers, Mr. Norwood mentioned that "distance insensitive" communication, at a low cost, is possible. Video tape systems are "moving along" and are expected in 1974-75. Of special importance to librarians is the fact, in Mr. Norwood's judgment, that education is expanding in three ways—in access, in years (lifelong learning), and in diversity—and that the expansion will place great demands on libraries and will require sophisticated communications technologies.

In closing, Mr. Shank emphasized that libraries should investigate their legal, financial, and manipulative requirements. Paraphrasing Ralph Lee Smith ("The Wired Nation," *Nation*, May 18, 1970) that there is still flexibility to create applicable telecommunications technology if planning comes soon, Mr. Shank challenged librarians to grasp the opportunity to plan.

The second and third programs were presented concurrently. Warren J. Haas, Columbia University, moderated "The Library Management Review and Analysis Program," assisted by Duane Webster of ARL and Lawrence Wilsey and Douglas Beaver of Booz, Allen, and Hamilton, Inc. In a prepared paper, Duane Webster stated that the ARL Management Review and Analysis Program provides a research library with guidelines for performing an internal study and evaluation of management policies, activities, and results. This systematic investigation of the functions of library management pinpoints the causes of operational problems and then guides the library in making necessary changes to improve the library's service to users and development of resources. The study focuses on the top management responsibilities and decision-making processes of the library.

Libraries participating in this program will receive a manual from ARL that provides a framework for conducting the self-study. The manual will include suggestions for study team composition, step-by-step procedures, schedules of work activity, analytical tables for use in probing the several management areas, and a description of expected results. Completion of the entire effort will require a period of six months.

The third session, on "The Interlibrary Loan Systems," was moderated by Arthur McAnally. Mr. McAnally commented on the "ARL Westat Study," which examined the magnitude and growth of interlibrary loan. He described the need for access to scholarly information at the national level, noting that requests to the national libraries have been heavy; in 1970, more than 3,385,000 individual trans-

actions were recorded, with 60 percent of all requests coming from academic institutions. Approximately 75 percent of all lending was effected by 113 large libraries with collections in excess of 500,000 volumes, which lent five times more than they borrowed. One interesting statistic was that 64.6 percent of requests from public libraries were by teletype.

Costs were cited per loan, and per search when the item was not located. The average cost per loan totaled $4.67, which, however, did not include amortized collection costs, institutional costs, photocopying costs, verification costs, and miscellaneous costs. Causes for the variation in cost figures were tied to policies regarding standards of service, location of the interlibrary loan activity within the library, centralization or dispersal of library resources, salary scales, size of collections, and efficiency of the loan unit.

It was estimated that current interlibrary loan costs are approximately $16,000,000—with the 113 libraries carrying $11 to $12 million of the burden.

Richard Chapin, Michigan State University, in "Continued Free Access," stated that interlibrary loan should be considered a free service because of subsidized government funding, existing agreements, cooperative acquisition programs, and the lifelong education concept. He urged that a method be developed to spread the request pattern, not to change from a free to a charge program.

William Dix, Princeton University, discussed the need for borrowing fees. He indicated that shared resources implied shared costs, if only through taxes, and recommended development of a program that would permit open participation, the possibility of fee waivers, uniform fee structure, and a large enough fee to cover all costs. A voucher system sponsored by the Federal Government was postulated. A spirited question-and-answer period followed.

At the luncheon, Frederick Burkhardt, Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), described the commission's work. He said that a full staff of five had been appointed and that the $200,000 authorized for use during the current fiscal year will probably be doubled next year. The commission, Mr. Burkhardt said, would remain small and active and work would be directed toward the development of a national plan—not a blueprint for a national system—but a plan for national needs. With regard to the many questions about the relationship of NCLIS to the advisory commission which preceded it, Mr. Burkhardt said there is no commitment to follow through on areas previously noted as important. After the planning effort has been completed, small task forces will be asked to find answers to specific questions. The focus will be on user groups and their needs, stressing user access.

At the present time, the small amount of money available is being used for two specific projects, the first phase of an outline of what will have to be done to draft a plan, and a feasibility study of the lending library concept.

Stressing that it was his personal view of appropriate NCLIS action, Mr. Burkhardt believed that the commission might arrange to serve in some sort of advisory capacity to the Library of Congress, push for funding of Federal legislation not fully funded to authorized levels, and encourage legislation spelling out fair use, as discussed in recent copyright actions. He stated that the problems, as he sees them, are not technological, but rather economic. The cost of information, he said, is pushing librarians to cooperative efforts.

Questions from the floor were answered by both Mr. Burkhardt and Charles Stevens, Executive Director of NCLIS.

In the fourth session, "The Evolving Status of Librarians in American Universities" was discussed by David Kaser of Cornell University, Edward G. Holley of the University of North Carolina, and Robert Van Waes, American Association of University Professors. Mr. Van Waes found librarians the forgotten part of the education equation, and saw faculty status as the "big rock candy mountain" for academic librarians. He stated that administrators, faculty, and librarians must move together toward implementation of faculty status for librarians.

Mr. Van Waes presented a statement which had been drafted by the Joint Committee on College Library Problems of the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Association of American Colleges, and the American Association of University Professors, and which is being referred to the three organizations for consideration and possible joint adoption. The paper, which focuses on a rationale but does not suggest specific procedures, in effect opens a new era for academic librarianship. The statement follows:

> As the primary means through which students and faculty gain access to the storehouse of organized knowledge, the college and university library performs a unique and indispen-

sable function in the educational process. This function will grow in importance as students assume greater responsibility for their own intellectual and social development. Indeed all members of the academic community are likely to become increasingly dependent on skilled professional guidance in the acquisition and use of library resources as the forms and numbers of these resources multiply, scholarly materials appear in more languages, bibliographical systems become more complicated, and library technology grows increasingly sophisticated. The librarian who provides such guidance plays a major role in the learning process.

The character and quality of an institution of higher learning are shaped in large measure by the nature of its library holdings and the ease and imagination with which those resources are made accessible to members of the academic community. Consequently, all members of the faculty should take an active interest in the operation and development of the library. Because the scope and character of library resources should be taken into account in such important academic decisions as curricular planning and faculty appointments, librarians should have a voice in the development of the institutions's educational policy.

Librarians perform a teaching and research role inasmuch as they instruct students formally and informally and advise and assist faculty in their scholarly pursuits. Librarians are also themselves involved in the research function; many conduct research in their own professional interests and in the discharge of their duties.

Where the role of college and university librarians, as described in the preceding paragraph, requires them to function essentially as part of the faculty, this functional identity should be recognized by granting of faculty status. Neither administrative responsibilities nor professional degrees, titles, or skills, *per se*, qualify members of the academic community for faculty status. The *function* of the librarian as participant in the processes of teaching and research is the essential criterion of faculty status.

College and university librarians share the professional concerns of faculty members. Academic freedom, for example, is indispensable to librarians, because they are trustees of knowledge with the responsibility of insuring the availability of information and ideas, no matter how controversial, so that teachers may freely teach and students may freely learn. Moreover, as members of the academic community, librarians should have latitude in the exercise of their professional judgment within the library, a share in shaping policy within the institution, and adequate opportunities for professional development and appropriate reward.

Faculty status entails for librarians the same rights and responsibilities as for other members of the faculty. They should have corresponding entitlement to rank, promotion, tenure, compensation, leaves, and research funds. They must go through the same process of evaluation and meet the same standards as other faculty members.

On some campuses, adequate procedures for extending faculty status to librarians have already been worked out. These procedures vary from campus to campus because of institutional differences. In the development of such procedures, it is essential that the general faculty or its delegated agent determine the specific steps by which any professional position is to be accorded faculty rank and status. In any case, academic positions which are to be accorded faculty rank and status should be approved by the senate or the faculty at large before submission to the president and to the governing board for approval.

With respect to library governance, it is to be presumed that the governing board, the administrative officers, the library faculty, and representatives of the general faculty will share in the determination of library policies that affect the general interests of the institution and its educational program. In matters of internal governance, the library will operate like other academic units with respect to decisions relating to appointments, promotions, tenure, and conditions of service.

In the fifth session, Duane Webster led a group discussion of "The Study of the Organization and Staffing of the Columbia University Libraries." Lawrence Wilsey and Douglas Beaver of Booz, Allen, and Hamilton, Inc., the group that performed the work in cooperation with ARL, also participated. Six specific problem areas were examined—how to organize the resources and services of a research library, how to treat specialized staff, the value of a management and planning staff, a new role for the personnel office, new management approaches, and staff participation in decision making. Warren J. Haas commented on the relationship between the study and the changing role of the library within the university.

In the final program, on May 13, "The Ohio College Library Center System and Regional Library Network" was considered. Richard DeGennaro, University of Pennsylvania, moderated a panel presentation which included Frederick Kilgour, Ohio College Library Center, Ronald Miller, New England Library and Information Network, and Lawrence Livingstone, Council on Library Resources, Inc.

The Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) is an operational on-line shared cataloging system providing 50 libraries with on-line search capability and an off-line card production system. Operational since 1971, OCLC was commended by Mr. DeGennaro as "far and away the best of its kind today."

Mr. Kilgour believed that in the next 10 years, all libraries will be involved in computerized cooperation for three reasons, primarily economic: the establishment of objectives that individual libraries cannot establish, the sharing of resources, and the pooling of human and financial resources to achieve a common goal. Two computer contributions to cooperation were listed, the ability of the computer to treat individuals as individuals, and the ability to supply the user with information when and where he needs it.

In pursuing his discussion of computerized cooperation, Mr. Kilgour said there was no model organization to emulate, that cooperatives must spread the word, and that standards must be developed and compliance sought. He commented on telephonic problems, the lack of stability in equipment, software problems, and the lack of qualified computer-oriented personnel.

He then described OCLC in detail, with attention to the shared cataloging system, interlibrary loan capabilities, serial central possibilities, the technical processing system, circulation system, and access points. He noted that 2,000 catalog records are generated each day and 14,000 to 17,000 cards produced each night. Cards are issued in packs, not sets. Mr. Kilgour stressed that the system is incomplete and "not the answer, but rather an early answer. . . . We have turned the corner and are going down the road."

Mr. Miller spoke on the results of a simulation of OCLC in the New England library community. He touched on such areas as message response time, and described work with the OCLC system at Dartmouth College.

Mr. Livingstone began his presentation with a statement that the printed page will remain with us and followed by stressing that librarians must learn more about technology.

In order to copy a system, according to OCLC, there are financial, legal, political, and technical problems to be faced. Mr. Livingstone noted finally the need for national attention to a central or at least coordinated name authority file.

In the business meeting that followed, Mr. MacDonald called for and received a vote on new membership requirements. The statement addressed member institutions, qualifications, termination of membership, and transfer of membership. Next, the president accepted the report of the Committee on Statistics. If their recommendations are accepted, the committee members feel they will result in holding the ARL statistics questionnaire to one page, utilizing the HEGIS Report as a readily available and practical means for reporting on doctoral fields, considering the adoption of the Unesco-recommended definition of periodicals to account for serials and journals, continuing the practice of accounting for differences, variations, and exceptions by footnoting pending establishment of acceptable standards, and, with the general acceptance of its recommendations, meeting the deadline for ARL statistics reporting and setting a basis for subsequent refinement and for the two-year review of admission criteria by the membership now required in the by-laws.

Douglas Bryant, Harvard University, next spoke as chairman of the ARL Commission on the Development of Resources. He discussed the activities of the Committee on Preservation and the foreign newspaper problem. He recommended that a committee be formed to study the data bank situation—material in computer readable form. The Farmington Plan was considered in detail, and the results of a questionnaire survey were presented. It was noted that there was confusion regarding the assignment of responsibility, that decisions to abandon commitments had been made without notifying ARL, and that there was widespread dissatisfaction with both operations and results. Mr. Bryant suggested a nationally based scheme with the purposes of the Farmington Plan—but outside the current framework—should be considered.

The Commission on the Organization of Resources was addressed by David Kaser, chairman, who had circulated a list of 21 possible activities and, based upon the response, identified serials, a machine-based cataloging system for monographs, and standards for bibliographic data bases for immediate attention.

Edward Latham, Dartmouth College, reported the Commission on Access to Resources. Three recommendations were made: to establish a new interlibrary loan committee, to consider access to manuscripts, and to make library service to external scholars and commercial users a priority.

The Commission on the Management of Research Libraries position was presented by Warren Haas and Duane Webster. Their work completed, two committees have been dissolved, the Committee on Training and the Committee on Security. Duane Webster talked of the ARL Library Management Review and Analysis Program, discussed fully the day before, and of the relationship with the American Council on Education. ARL University Library Management Studies Office accomplishments were noted in the areas of research and development, pub-

lications, workshops, and consultative activities.

The Commission on External Affairs will be led by Roy Kidman, University of Southern California. Mr. MacDonald indicated that ARL would direct attention to the status of women, and also encouraged broadened participation in IFLA affairs. The executive director's report by Stephen McCarthy concluded the meeting. [*Frank Kurt Cylke*]